

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/518,421	03/03/2000	Victor Rossin	805.300US01	6283
7590 03/08/2004			EXAMINER	
CHRISTOPHER F. REGAN			RODRIGUEZ, ARMANDO	
ALLEN, DYER, DOPPELT, MILBRATH & GILCHRIST, P.A.				
P.O. BOX 3791	•	,	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	L 32802-3791		2828	

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
مري مريد Advisory Action	09/518,421	ROSSIN ET AL.
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Armando Rodriguez	2828
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 13 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the control of the control	ation. A proper reply to a name places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing by The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the content of th	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CFI extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	<u> </u>	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because:		dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	• • •	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected:		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by t	ne Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	
10. Other:	, –	
		Paul Ip Supervisor Art Unit 2828

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Applicant has amended independents claims 1 and 17 to recite a limitation, which implies the elimination of a "kink" when the laser is operated to provide output power above 400 mW, such a limitation was not presented for considereation during previous examination of the claims and would require a new search. Applicant has also amended the claims to recite a curve, which compares the output power vs. current as illustrated in figures 3A, 4 and 5 such a limitation which implies applicant's drawings is imprope see MPEP 608.01 and 37 CFR 1.58.